APPENDIX 1A

REFERENCES

REFERENCE LIST

1. WCCSL, Inc. Report of Disposal Site Information for the WCCSL. Updated March 18, 2002.

2. WCCSL, Inc. Bulk Materials Processing Center, Final Development and Improvements Plan (Part 3). March 2002.

3. WCCSL, Inc. Bulk Materials Processing Center, Final Development and Improvements Plan (Part 3), Draft. August 2002.

4. WCCSL, Inc. Report of Composting Site Information for the WCCSL Composting/ Mulch Facility. March 2000.

5. Brady and Associates. North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan. June 1993.

6. Brady and Associates. North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan EIR. May 1992.

7. City of Richmond Planning Department. Volume One of the Richmond General Plan. August 1994.

8. Environmental Science Associates, Inc. City of Richmond General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Updates, Program EIR. August 17, 1993.

9. Environmental Science Associates, Inc. Draft EIR on the West County Integrated Resource Recovery Facility, Volume 1. September 1991.

10. John Carollo Engineers. West Contra Costa Sanitary District Wastewater Facilities Plan. March 1993.

11. BAAQMD. CEQA Guidelines. December 1999.

12. Contra Costa County Community Development Department. Contra Costa County General Plan, 1990-2005, January 1991.

13. Contra Costa County Community Development Department. Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the WCCSL Soil Remediation Facility. January 1995.

14. RWQCB. Order No. 96-079. Updated Waste Discharge Requirements for the WCCSL. June 19, 1996.

15. Contra Costa County. Scenic Routes Element. 1974.

16. Contra Costa County. Safety Element. 1975.

17. RWQCB. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin. June 21, 1995.

18. BCDC. San Francisco Bay Plan. As amended May 11, 1994.

19. Contra Costa County. Seismic Safety Element. 1975.

20. West County Landfill, Inc. Draft Post-Closure Permit Application – Hazardous Waste Management Facility. May 2002.

21. Contra Costa County. Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. May 1993.

22. Contra Costa County. Non-Disposal Facilities Element. May 1993.

23. Contra Costa County Department of Health Services. Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the WCCSL Solid Waste Facilities Permit and Landfill Closure and Postclosure Maintenance Plans. May 1996.

24. ET Environmental. Description of Waste Recycling Center Development Options at Area A and at the Soil Remediation Building. October 30, 2002.

25. WCCSL. Draft Biosolids Application Evaluation Progress Report for the West County Landfill (Draft). October 2002.

26. WCCSL. Monthly and Quarterly Monitoring Reports (2001 and 2002) for Current Traffic Flow and Waste Quantities.

27. WCCSL. Appendices B – S, Report of Disposal Site Information for the WCCSL, Volume 3 of 3. March 18, 2002.

28. WCCSL. Bulk Materials Processing Center, Part 2 – Land Use Permit Application: Summary Document. January 2002.

29. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region. Order No. R2-2002-0066 for WCCSL Class II Waste Management Facility. June 19, 2002.

30. BAAQMD. Permit to Operate, Plant #1840.

31. BAAQMD. Final Major Facility Review Permit, WCCSL, Inc. #A1840.

32. Contra Costa County. Land Use Permit 2053-92, Conditions of Approval, West Contra Costa Integrated Resource Recovery Facility Central Processing, July 13, 1993.

33. Brown and Caldwell. Draft EIR on the WCCSL Hazardous Waste Management Facility Closure and Postclosure Plans. September 1998.

34. EBRPD. Master Plan 1989. Adopted May 17, 1988.

35. Contra Costa County Community Development Department. Five Year CIWMP Review Report for Contra Costa County. September 19, 2002.

36. Personal communication from Mr. Cecil Felix, RWQCB, November 12, 2002.

37. BAAQMD. Permit to Operate, Plant No. 198.

38. WCCSL, Inc. Memorandum to County LEA and RWQCB regarding remaining landfill capacity, October 10, 2002.

39. Personal communication with Mr. Larry Burch, WCCSL, Inc., November 27, 2002.

40. Personal communication with Mr. Terry Noonan, EBRPD, December 3, 2002.

41. Personal communication with Ms. Roberta Goulart, Contra Costa County, December 2, 2002.

42. Personal communication with Mr. Cecil Felix, RWQCB, December 4, 2002.

43. WCCSL, Inc. West County Waste Recycling Center Transfer/Processing Draft Report, January 2003.

44. BAAQMD. Regulation 7, May 21, 1980.

45. Personal communication from Ms. Rochelle Walker, Public Records, BAAQMD, November 23, 2002.

46. Agreement between the City of Richmond and WCL, Inc. regarding acceptance of leachate diverted by the WCWD to the City of Richmond Treatment Plant, April 24, 2001.

47. Personal communication with Mr. Lori Braunesreitler, Contra Costa County LEA, January 6, 2003.

48. EMCON/OWT, Inc. Revised Final Cover Design for West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill Class II Site. January, 2003

49. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Composting Yard Trimmings and Municipal Solid Waste. EPA 530-R-94-003. May 1994.

50. California Oak Mortality Task Force, http://www.suddenoakdeath.org/

51. Personal communication with Mr. Shawn Edgar, Edgar & Associates, December 11, 2002.

52. EMCON/OWT, Inc. Class II Landfill Slope Stability Analysis for the WCSL. January 2003.

53. Fire Incident Report from Larry Burch to Lori Braunesreitler of the LEA, August 28, 2001.

54. Fire Incident Report from Larry Burch to Lori Braunesreitler of the LEA, August 28, 2002.

55. Personal communication from Larry Burch, WCL, Inc., January 29, 2003.

56. 7 CFR Part 301, Phytophthora Ramorum; Quarantine and Regulations, Federal Register, Vol. 67, No. 31, February 14, 2002.

57. Personal communication from Mr. Cecil Felix, RWQCB, February 6, 2003.

58. WCL, Inc., "Remaining Landfill Capacity", January 2003.

59. Brown and Caldwell. Daft EIR B&J Landfill Master Development Plan, Volume 2 Appendices. December 1997.

60. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 4.1. 2002.

61. Personal communication with Mr. Lynn Cardoza, dredging program manager of the Port of Oakland, March 8, 2003.

62. WCCSL, Inc. and TPS Technologies. Report of Waste Discharge for the 3.2 Acre Property at WCCSL. January 1995.

63. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Revised San Francisco Bay Area ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard, October 24, 2001.

64. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan and Triennial Assessment, December 20, 2000.

65. California Air Resources Board. Ambient Air Quality Standards. January 9, 2003.

66. USEPA. Compilation of Air Pollution Emission Factors, AP-YZ. 1998.

67. Spencer, Robert and Charlie Alix. Biofilter Design, Care and Feeding, Biocycle, January 2003.

68. Personal communication from Larry Burch, WCL, Inc. regarding aerated static pile, March 3, 2003.

69. WCL, Inc. Draft Revisions to WCL Postclosure Plan and Draft Revisions to the WCL RDSI, March 21, 2003.

70 Atwater, B. F., Ancient Processes at the Site of Southern San Francisco Bay: Movement of the Crust and Changes in Sea Level, in San Francisco Bay: The Urbanized Estuary, Conomos, T. J. editor, Pacific Division, American Association for Advancement of Science, San Francisco, pp. 31-45. 1979.

71. Atwater, B. F., Hedel, C. W., and Helley, E. J., Later Quaternary depositional History, Holocene Sea-Level Changes, and Vertical Crustal Movements, Southern San Francisco Bay, California, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1014, 15p. 1977.

72. Atwater, B. F., Conrad, S. G., Powdery, J. H., Hedel, C. W., MacDonald, R. L., and Savage, W. (1979), History landforms and Vegetation of the Estuaries Tidal Marshes, in San Francisco Bay: The Urbanized Estuary, Conomos ,T. J. editor, Pacific Division, American Association for Advancement of Science, San Francisco, pp. 347-381. 1979.

73. Burke, D.B., and Helley, E.J, Map Showing Evidence for Recent Fault Activity in the Vicinity of Antioch, Contra Costa County, California, U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-533, scale 1:24,000. 1973.

74 California Division of Mines and Geology, Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for the State of California, DMG Open-File Report 96-08. 1996.

75. Carey, D. (1992), Seismic Risk Assessment of the Brentwood Area, Eastern Contra Costa County, in Borchardt, Glenn, et al., (eds.), Proceedings of the Second Conference on Earthquake Hazards in the Eastern San Francisco Bay Area, California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 113, pp. 549-555.

76 Personal communication with Mr. Larry Burch, WCL, Inc., April 8, 2003.

77. CCTA. The 2000 Update to the Contra Costa County Comprehensive Transportation Plan. July 19, 2000.

78. ET Environmental, West Contra Costa Landfill Area A Transfer Station Development Option, Draft Report. 2003.

79. ET Environmental (2002), West Contra Costa Landfill Soil Storage Building Development Option, Draft report. 2002.

80. Page, B. M., Geology of the Coast Ranges of California, in Geology of Northern California, Bailey, E. H. editor, Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin, No. 190, pp. 253-321. 2002.

81. State of California, California Code of Regulations, Combined SWRCB/CIWMB Regulations Division 2, Title 27. 1966.

82. Toppozada, T. R. and Borchardt G., Re-Evaluation of the 1836 Hayward Fault and the 1838 San Andreas Fault earthquakes, *Bulletin of Seismological Society of America*, 88(1), 140-159.

83. U.S. Geological Survey, Database of Potential Sources for Earthquakes Larger than Magnitude 6 in Northern California: Open File Report 96-705 1998.

84. Wahler Associates, Final Static and Seismic Stability Analyses, Class II Area, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill. 1996.

85. Wakabayashi, J. and Smith, D. L. Evaluation of recurrence intervals, characteristic earthquakes, and slip-rates associated with the thrusting along the Coast Range-Central Valley geomorphic boundary, California: Bulletin of Seismological Society of America, v. 84, pp. 1960-1970. 1994.

86. West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Evaluation of Landfill Settlement at West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill. 1999.

87. West County Landfill, Inc., West County Landfill Class II Landfill, Postclosure Plan Appendix PCP-I Attachment 1, Response Actions for Seismically Induced Slope Displacements, Preliminary Evaluation of Possible Seismic Event Impacts, Draft. 2003.

88. West County Landfill, Inc., Proposed WCL Report of Disposal Site Information Changes for C&D ADC Program, Revisions to Subsection V.D.5.a on p. 148. 2003

89. Wills, C.J. The Elusive Antioch Fault (abs): Program with Abstracts, Second Conference on Earthquake Hazards in Eastern San Francisco Bay Area, p. 84. 1992.

90. Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Geotechnical Engineering Study, TPS Technologies, Inc., Soil Remediation Facility, Richmond, California. 1992.

91. Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP), Earthquake probabilities in the San Francisco Bay region: 2000 to 2030 – A summary of findings, Open File Report 99-517. 1999.

92. Personal communication with Mr. Nick Candos, California Department of Food and Agriculture, June 19, 2003.

93. CCTA. Guidelines for Preparation of Traffic Studies and Reports. August 1992.

94. Transportation Research Board. Highway Capacity Manual Special Report 209. 2002.

95. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington D.C. Trip Generation – An Informational report. 1999.

96. Transportation Research Board. Four-Way Stop Intersection Capacity Methodology. Circular 373. 1991.

97. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation service. Soil Survey of Contra Costa County. 1977.

98. Association of Bay Area Governments. Wildlife and Public Access Study. An Ecological Investigation Sponsored by the San Francisco Bay Trail Project, Preliminary Findings; 2 Years of Field Research from the Wildlife and Public Access Study, prepared by Lynne Trulio and Hana Sokale. 2002.

99. California Department of Fish and Game. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System, California Wildlife, Volume I, Amphibians and Reptiles. May 2, 1988.

100. California Department of Fish and Game. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System, California Wildlife, Volume II, Birds. November, 1990.

101. California Department of Fish and Game. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System, California Wildlife Volume III, Mammals. April, 1990.

102. California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Data Base, "Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California". 2002.

103. California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Data Base, "Special Animals and Special Plants" 2002.

104. California Department of Fish and Game, "Record Search by the California Natural Diversity Data Base of the San Quentin and Richmond Quadrangle". 2002.

105. California Native Plant Society. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California Special Publication No. 1 (6th Edition). 2001.

106. Contra Costa County. "West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Contra Costa County – Proposed Amendment of Land Use Permit (I.P. #022026): Summary of Field Visit on February 28, 2003, letter to Mr. John Krause, Associate Wildlife Biologist, from Deidra Dingman, Solid Waste Program Manager," March 10, 2003.

107. Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. "Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States", "U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 1979.

108. Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual, Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss. January 1987.

109. Environmental Stewardship & Planning. "West County Sanitary Landfill, Bayside Trail (Barrier) Planting Recommendations." March, 2003.

110. Hall, E.R. The Mammals of North America, University of California Press, Berkeley. 1981.

111. Hickman, J.C. The Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California, University of California Press, Berkeley, California. 1993.

112. Munz, P. and D. Keek. A California Flora and Supplement. 1973.

113. Peterson, R. T. Field Guide to Western Birds, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. 1969.

114. Stebbins, R.C. A Field Guide to Western Reptiles and Amphibians, 2nd Edition, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1985.

115. Sawyer, J.O. and T. Keeler-Wolf. A Manual of California Vegetation, California Native Plant Society, Sacramento. 1995.

116. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands: California (Region 0, "Biological Report 88" (26.10). 1988.

117. LSA Associates. "Results of Wildlife Surveys at the WCCSL". 2002.

118. West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority. Final Regional Integrated Waste Management Plan and Regional Education and Public Information Program. August 1995.

119. Personal communication from Mr. David Dwinell, Corps of Engineers, May 22, 2003.

120. Personal communication from Mr. Lynn Cardoza, dredging program manager from the Port of Oakland, May 22, 2003.

121. WCL, Inc. Second Half 2002 Monitoring Report. January 2003.

122. California Integrated Waste Management Board. LEA Advisory No. 6. "*Aspergillus, Aspergillosis,* and Composting Operations in California," December 16, 1993.

123. California Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Investigations Branch, "Bioaerosols and Green-Waste Composting in California," June 1999.

124. Brown and Caldwell in association with E&A Environmental Consultants. Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Biosolids Compost Project, Volume I. June 1995.

125. Personal communication from Larry Burch, WCL, Inc., June 26, 2003.

126. WCL, Inc. WCCSL Final Closure Plan. August 1994.

127. WCL, Inc. WCCSL Final Postclosure Maintenance Plan. September 1994.

128. Environmental Science Associates. Administrative Draft EIR for the Richmond Parkway Commerce Center. April 8, 2003.

129. California Integrated Waste Management Board. Technical Summary Report Test Method Correlation and Air Emissions Based on Combined Data for Tests Conducted by California Integrated Waste Management Board and South Coast Air Quality Management District at a Green Material Composting Facility. June 18, 2002.

130. California Integrated Waste Management Board. Air Emissions Tests Conducted at Green Material Processing Facilities. February 22, 2002.

131. Personal communication with Ms. Carol Allen, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, September 12, 2003.

132. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Users Guide for the Industrial Source Complex (ISC3) Dispersion Models. Report EPA-454/b-003a, September 1995.

133. California Air Resources Board. Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles. October 2000.

134. Personal communication from Ms. Hillary Heard, County Transportation Planning Division, September 18, 2003.

135. California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Part B. Health Risk Assessment for Diesel Exhaust. May 1998.

APPENDIX 1B

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

The WCCSL Bulk Materials Processing Center project changes involve revisions to the existing City and County use permits. The current state/LEA issued Composting Permit needs to be replaced with a more full-materials composting permit. The Waste Recycling Center will require a new Solid Waste Facilities Permit from the LEA and California Integrated Waste Management Board.

During the permit update process it will be useful to center on certain definitions of the various activities or process products since the existing permits use terms that need better description. Terms and definitions for each Bulk Materials Processing Center are listed below. Following those listings is a general category of other terms and definitions.

Composting Facility

This expanded facility is proposed to handle a series of different waste feedstock types. The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Compostibles or Compost Feedstock: means any decomposable organic material used in the production of compost or chipped and ground material including, but not limited to, clean green material, green material, animal material, sewage sludge, and mixed solid waste. Feedstocks shall not be considered as either additives or amendments.

- Green Material: means any plant material that is either separated at the point of generation, or separated at a centralized facility than employs methods to minimize contamination. Green material includes, but is not limited to, yard trimmings, plant wastes from the food processing industry, manure, untreated wood wastes, paper products, and natural fiber products. Green material does not include treated wood waste, mixed demolition or mixed construction debris.

- Food Wastes or Plant Wastes: from the food processing industry including the vegetative and food materials from the fresh food packing and marketing industry, food canning and freezing industry, food marketing industry (wholesale warehouses, produce markets), and residential food wastes.

- Mixed Wastes: paper, cardboard, wood, excluding wood products that may contain pentachlorophenol, arsenical, or creosote type preservatives and wood painted with lead based paint, (no unsorted garbage and trash will be processed).

- Composting Facility Area or Operations Area: The total area encompassed in the facility boundary used for compostibles receiving, processing and finished product storage; also includes the ancillary areas including the equipment storage activities for the facility and the runoff channels and runoff ponding area.

- Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading compostible materials.

- Raw Material Stockpile: The area used to temporarily store the compostible materials prior to shredding or placement in windrows.

- Shredding/Grinding Area: The area used for shredding/grinding the compostible materials. Screening may also occur here.

- Shredded Material Stockpile: The area used for temporary storage of the shredded materials prior to placement of them in windrows for composting.

- Pre-Composting Area: The area(s) that may be used seasonally for the initial composting of the shredded material in larger piles or windrows prior to placement of the shredded material in the compost windrows.

- Compost Windrows Area: The area where the series of windrows are laid out for the major composting activity.

- Compost Maturing/Storage Area: The area used to store the compost removed from windrows during the last period of composting when the maturing cycle is completed.

- Compost Screening Area: An area where the mechanical screening activity occurs to separate the finished compost product; several sizes of materials may be created involving several storage piles adjacent to the screening machine.

- Overs Storage Area: The area used to store the large-sized materials removed from the finished compost product during the mechanical screening process.

- Finished Compost Product Storage Area: The area used to store the compost product while awaiting loadout for ultimate use.

- Composting Facility Other Area: The ancillary portions of the composting facility that includes the administration activities for the facility and the runoff channels and runoff ponding area.

Wood Materials Recovery Facility

Also operated in conjunction within the Compost Facility boundary is a wood materials recovery facility. The expanded facility is proposed to be operated under the mulching facilities tiered registration process established by the CIWMB. The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Wood Materials: Wood materials such as dimensional lumber, pallets, branches and stumps are ground into chips for either a biofuel market or for landscaping mulch. Certain materials received in a shredded state may need only to be screened. Some larger sized tree limbs and trunks are separated for firewood. Some of the oversized materials screened out at the composting facility will be further processed here. Large sized items such as tree trunks and stumps are now being added to the processing program since a larger wood waste shredder is now available.

- Wood Materials Recovery Area: The total area encompassed in the facility boundary used for wood materials receiving, processing and finished product storage; also includes the ancillary areas. This actually will be co-located with the Compost Facility since the shredder processes both compostible materials and wood wastes.

- Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading wood materials.

- Wood Materials Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the wood materials prior to shredding or other handling of the materials.

- Wood Materials Processing Area: The area where the wood materials are processed such as by shredding or sorting or screening.

- Wood Products Storage Area: The area(s) used to store the recovered wood products while awaiting loadout for ultimate use.

- Wood Materials Recovery Facility Other Area: The ancillary portions of the wood materials recovery facility that includes the equipment storage activities for the facility and other ancillary features.

Concrete and Asphalt Processing Facility

The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Concrete/Asphalt Materials: This facility handles concrete and asphalt debris materials delivered to the WCCSL by self-haul deliveries, primarily from general construction contractors. The materials are crushed into the various sizes of gravel and rock products needed for the construction market.

- Processing Center Area: The total area encompassed in the facility boundary used for concrete and asphalt materials receiving, processing and finished product storage. This area will be located adjacent to the Compost Facility and we wish to develop a flexible boundary between the two areas to allow for seasonal production changes of both compost and rock products.

- Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading concrete rubble and asphalt debris materials.

- Asphalt Materials Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the asphalt debris materials prior to crushing, screening or other handling of the materials.

- Concrete Materials Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the concrete rubble materials prior to crushing, screening or other handling of the materials.

- Materials Processing Area: The area where the asphalt and concrete materials are processed such as by crushing, sorting or screening.

- Asphalt Products Storage Area: The area(s) used to store the recovered asphalt products while awaiting loadout for ultimate use.

- Concrete Products Storage Area: The area(s) used to store the recovered concrete products while awaiting loadout for ultimate use.

- Concrete & Asphalt Materials Recovery Facility Other Area: The ancillary portions of the materials recovery facility that includes the administration activities for the facility and other ancillary features.

Waste Recycling Center

The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Waste Recycling Center Feedstock Wastes: The WRC will receive and handle the trash and rubbish delivered by the self-haul customers and non-franchised commercial haulers after the landfill is filled to capacity. The mixed wastes would be unloaded, recyclables would be salvaged, and the residue would be placed in transfer trucks for transport to the Potrero Hills Landfill in Solano County. This facility also would receive green materials and wood wastes delivered to the WCCSL by deliveries from citizens, yard cleanup firms, and contractors.

- Waste Recycling Center Area: The total area encompassed in the facility boundary used for trash and rubbish receiving, compostibles and wood materials receiving, processing operations, loadout of residue, and finished product storage; also includes the ancillary areas. This site also would include the location of the receiving and shredding operation for green materials and wood wastes delivered to the WCCSL by deliveries from citizens, yard cleanup firms, and contractors.

- Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading rubbish and trash and other materials; this area is also used to temporarily store the rubbish and trash prior to examining the materials for salvageable content.

- Green Materials and Wood Materials Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the green materials and wood materials prior to shredding or other handling of the materials.

- Mixed Waste Processing Area: The area where the mixed wastes are inspected for salvageable content and where the materials are sorted. Some of the processing will be done by hand and some by mechanized equipment.

- Compostibles and Wood Materials Processing Area: The area where the compostibles and wood materials are processed such as by shredding or sorting or screening.

- Mixed Waste Storage Area: The area where the residues are stored prior to loadout and also including the transfer trailer loading area.

- Household Hazardous Waste Storage Unit: This storage unit will be used to handle and temporarily store motor oil, vehicle batteries, antifreeze, paint, and other household chemicals collected during load checks.

- Equipment Maintenance Center: This facility will be the relocated maintenance facility for the tractors, trucks and other equipment used at the WRC, Wood Waste Recovery Facility and Composting Facility. This installation will replace the existing maintenance facility located at the extreme northeast corner of the WCCSL.

- Waste Recycling Center Other Area: The ancillary portions of the Waste Recycling Center that includes the administration activities for the facility and other ancillary features.

Soil Remediation Facility

The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Feedstock Wastes: This facility processes liquids and soil that contains residues of gasoline, diesel and other hydrocarbon fuels, and other liquids. Wastes such as biosolids may also be processed.

- Soil Remediation Facility Area: The total area encompassed in the facility boundary used for contaminated soil or other material receiving, processing operations, loadout of residue, and finished product storage; also includes the ancillary areas.

- Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading waste materials;

- Materials Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the waste liquids and soil materials prior to processing the materials.

- Processing Area: The area where the liquids and soils and are processed.

- Residues Storage Area: The area where the rocks and rubble residues are stored prior to loadout.

- Finished Product Storage Area: The area where the processed soil is stored prior to loadout.

Soil Reclamation Facility

The following are definitions and descriptions for this facility.

- Soils Receiving/Unloading Area: The area used to park vehicles while receiving/unloading soil materials; the soil reclamation would be conducted on the unused portions of the composting and wood waste recovery areas.

- Soils Storage Area: The area used to temporarily store the soil materials prior to processing or other handling of the materials.

- Soil Processing Area: The area where the soils are processed. The primary soil reclamation operations would entail mechanical screening of soil to remove rock and debris. The screened soil would be separated into material suitable for trench backfill or building pad engineered fill, and also soil to be blended with sand and/or compost to produce topsoil.

- Residues Storage Area: The area where the rocks and rubble residues are stored prior to loadout.

- Finished Product Storage Area: The area where the processed soil is stored prior to loadout.

Other Terms and Definitions

- AB939: State adopted regulation to foster statewide increases in waste reduction, reuse and recycling
- ADC: Alternative daily cover which are substitute materials used to cover the wastes placed in the landfill instead of using soil
- ADT: Average Daily Traffic counting inbound and outbound trips
- BAAQMD: Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- BCDC: Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- CAMU Corrective Action Management Unit
- CC/WCFPD: Contra Costa/West County Fire Protection District
- CCDD: Contra Costa County Community Development Department
- CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act
- CFC: Chloroflurocarbons contained in refrigeration systems
- CIWMB: California Integrated Waste Management Board
- Class II Landfill: The WCCSL general municipal solid waste landfill
- CPCF: WCCSL Closure/Postclosure Plans
- DRO: City of Richmond Development Review Organization
- DTSC: State Department of Toxic Substance Control
- EBMUD: East Bay Municipal Utilities District which provides potable water in the area
- EIR: Environmental Impact Report prepared as a CEQA compliance activity
- EPCRA: Federal Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-know Act
- FDIP: Final Development and Improvements Plan
- HWMF: Hazardous Waste Management Facility, also referred to as the Class I site
- IRRF: West County Integrated Resource Recovery Facility, located at Central and Pittsburg Avenues
- Landfill Gas: Gases produced from the decomposition of organic solid wastes in the landfill
- LEA: Local Enforcement Agency (Contra Costa County Health Services Department)
- Leachate: Liquid that is derived from water contacting the solid wastes
- MSL: Mean Sea Level

- MSW: Municipal Solid Waste
- NPDES: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
- OCC: Cardboard and linerboard
- OES: California Office of Emergency Services
- PDRB: City of Richmond Public Development Review Board
- POTW: Publicly Operated Treatment Works referred to also as sewage or wastewater treatment plant
- RCSI: Report of Composting Site Information for the WCCSL composting program
- RDSI: Report of Disposal Site Information for the WCCSL landfill operation
- RSS, Inc.: Richmond Sanitary Service Inc.
- TPD7: Daily Tons Per Day, averaged over a 7-day week; same as dividing the annual tonnage by 365 days
- SWPPP: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
- WCCSL: West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, the property
- WCCSL, Inc.: West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Inc., site operator
- WCL, Inc.: West County Landfill, Inc., site owner
- WRC: Waste Recycling Center at the WCCSL where solid waste will be recycled and transferred

APPENDIX 1C

INITIAL STUDY

2. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section presents initial analyses and evaluations of potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The checklist from the CEQA *Guidelines* is used to evaluate potential impacts by environmental subject area.

The proposed land use permit amendment and related actions (also referred to as "the Project") at the Bulk Materials Processing Center (BMPC) operated by the West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill. The project's location, design, and operation (internal operating practices and control measures) would eliminate the potential for some environmental impacts including:

- Agricultural resources
- Mineral resources
- Population and housing
- Public services
- Recreation, and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

In the checklist that follows, the rationale is presented if these potential impacts are less-than-significant or would not occur. During review of the proposed project design, location, and operation, the following potential impacts were identified for further analysis and evaluation in an environmental impact report (EIR):

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise, and
- Transportation

SOURCES

This environmental evaluation draws upon multiple data sources including those generated by the the Community Development Department, the Applicant - West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill (WCCSL), and Contra Costa Environmental Health as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). In the process of preparing this Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following sources (which are available for review by appointment at the Contra Costa County Community Development Department – Solid Waste Division, 651 Pine Street, County Administration Building, 4th Floor, North Wing, Martinez, CA) were consulted:

1. Determined based on location of project.

2. Determined based on CDD staff office review.

3. Determined based on CDD staff field review, February 14, 2002

4. Determined based on Project Overview and Description submitted by Applicant - (Part 1 Executive Summary, and Part 2 Summary Document).

5. Determined based on County General Plan and Zoning Maps.

6. Bulk Materials Processing Center, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Land Use Permit No. 2054-92 1993, and No. 2043-94 1995.

7. City of Richmond Conditional Use Permit No. 92-53, 1993.

8. Solid Waste Facility Permit, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, #07-AA-0001, 1998.

9. Final Development and Improvements Plan, Bulk Materials Processing Center, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, March 2002.

10. Composting Facility Permit, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, #07-AA-0044, 1996.

11. Authority to Construct/Operate, West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Plant No. 1840.

12. Approved Hazardous Waste Management Facility Closure Plan, 2000.

13. Approved Class II Site Closure Plan, 1994.

14. West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill Hazardous Waste Management Facility Closure and Post Closure Plans, Draft Environmental Impact Report, September 1998.

15. Draft Environmental Impact Report, North Richmond Shoreline Specific, May 1992

16. Final Environmental Impact Report, Responses to Comments, North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan, November 1992.

17. Order No. R2-2002-0066, SFRWQCB, Updated Waste Discharge Requirements and Recission of Order No. 96-079, June 2002.

18. Public Access Shoreline Trail Draft Development Plan, January 2002.

19. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No, CAS000002.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Quad Sheet	?
Assessor Parcel #	408-140-008; 408-140-009; 408-140-010; 408-140-013
Date of Site Visit	February 14, 2002

Note: Indicated panel numbers refer to U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute quadrangle map sheets located in the Contra Costa County Community Development Department offices at 651 Pine Street 2nd floor, North Wing, Martinez, California 94553.

I. AESTHETICS

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it blocked or had an adverse effect on scenic vistas or scenic resources, or if it introduced a new source of substantial light or glare.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source 1,2,3,4,18)	*X*			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source 2,3,5)				*X*
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Source 2,3,5)			*X*	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source 1,2,3,4)			*X*	

Discussion

The proposed project involves a major expansion of existing composting, concrete crushing uses/operations areas at the top of the landfill plateau, in addition to either a new or modified building for waste recycling, sorting, and transfer. The potential exists for view obstruction from specific vantage points along the Richmond Parkway. The proposed height increase of the landfill cap, could increase the potential for visual impacts. Nighttime conditions related to lights and glare could also be affected by proposed expansion of facility operating hours.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would directly or indirectly convert farmland that is classified as Prime, Unique, or of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, or if it would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source 1,2,3,4,6)				*X*
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Source 1,2,3,4,6)				*X*
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Source 1,2,3,4,6)				*X*

Discussion

No farmland or agricultural land would be converted. No conflict would exist with existing zoning on other portions of the WCCSL property. No impact to agricultural resources would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

III. AIR QUALITY

Significance Criteria

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance for construction impacts, project operations and cumulative impacts. The project would be considered to have a significant effect on the environment if its operation would generate emissions in excess of thresholds established by the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* (BAAQMD, 1999). Significant air quality impacts would occur if the proposed actions individually or cumulatively cause a net increase in pollutant emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), or respirable particulate matter (PM-10) exceeding 80 pounds per day or 15 tons per year, or if expanded or new stationary sources would cause a net increase in carbon monoxide (CO) emissions exceeding 550 pounds per day.

With respect to odors, the BAAQMD's significance criteria are more subjective and are based on the number of odor complaints generated by a project. The BAAQMD considers odor impacts for projects locating near an existing source of odors to be significant if there has been either: (1) more than one confirmed complaint per year averaged over a three year period; or (2) three unconfirmed complaints per year averaged over a three-year period.

For construction impacts, the pollutant of greatest concern to the BAAQMD is PM-10. The BAAQMD recommends that significance be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented during project construction. The *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* contains a list of feasible control measures for construction-related PM-10 emissions.

Any proposed project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source #2,8,10,11)				*X*
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source #2,8,10,11)	*X*			
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source #2,6,11)			*X*	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source #1,2,3,4)				*X*
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source #1,3,4)	*X*			

Discussion

Local and regional impacts on air quality could occur from vehicles, trucks, equipment handling of waste materials, and dust generated during operations. There will be an incremental increase of

emissions resulting from proposed expansion of bulk materials processing. Truck and auto traffic is projected to increase with expanded operations, resulting in potential increases in vehicle emissions. Drying and handling of sludge materials may result in particulate emissions and nuisance odors. There may be sensitive receptors in nearby residential and/or commercial uses in proximity of the WCCSL.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria

The project would have a significant impact on the environment if it would directly or indirectly have a substantial, adverse effect on a special status species; if it would have a substantial adverse effect on a riparian area or wetland; if it would adversely modify a wildlife migration corridor; or if it would be in conflict with a local, State, or federal plan to protect biological resources.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source 1,2,3,4)	*X*			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source 1,2,3,4,5)				*X*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Source #1,2,3,4,5,15)				*X*
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Source #1,2,3,15)				*X*
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Source #1,2,5)				*X*
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Source #1,2,5,15)				*X*

Discussion

Existing and proposed landfill facilities and/or operations are not located in any animal habitat and do not produce any animal food resource. Project activities would not directly occur in any sensitive habitats, and would not affect animal species populations or diversity. No new animal species would be introduced. The project site is not located in, or adjacent to, any animal migration routes; however, implementation of Phase 1 of the public access trail could indirectly impact biological resources, particularly nesting or brooding migratory water fowl. An evaluation of habitat and species adjacent to the trail should be conducted.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it disturbed, destroyed, or caused a substantial adverse change in a unique archaeological, historical, or paleontological resource, or if it disturbed any human remains.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Source #1,3,5,6,15)				*X*
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Source #1,2,15)				*X*
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Source #1,2,15)				*X*
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source #1,2,15)				*X*

Discussion

The Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University was contacted to assess potential impacts to cultural or historic resources. Their review of the California Historical Resources Information System identified no historical resources based on a study covering 98 percent of the project area. The unsurveyed portion of the project area is considered to have a low possibility of historical resources. Further study for historical resources was not recommended. The landfill and surrounding areas are not the subject of any ethnic cultural use, identity, or values; and are not used for any existing religious or sacred purposes. No impact to cultural resources would likely occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment if it were to expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death from seismic events, landslides, or other geologic hazards; or if it would cause substantial erosion and loss of topsoil.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	*X*			
• Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Source #1, 2,4,5) Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	*X*			
• Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source #1,2,5,6,15)	*X*			
• Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source #1,2,5,15)	*X*			
• Landslides? (Source #1,2,3,5)				*X*
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source #1,2,3,6)				*X*
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Source #1,2,6,18)	*X*			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source #1,2,6,18)	*X*			
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Source #1,2,6)				*X*

Discussion

The San Francisco Bay region is an area of high seismicity and has a documented history of strong earthquakes. Active and potentially active earthquake faults are located in the region. The WCCSL site overlies San Francisco Bay Mud and thus is subject to settlement and or liquefaction during a seismic event. Major excavation of soils, changes in geologic substructures, surface grading, and/or alteration of ground surface relief features may occur. People or property may be exposed to new, or increased geologic hazards during, or after, completion of the proposed project. Earthquake faults in the immediate vicinity of WCCSL area, or faults of potential local significance within about 12 miles of the WCCSL site, should be identified and evaluated. All WCCSL facilities shall be designed to meet Federal Subtitle D regulations for seismic design of solid waste facilities. Design and construction of all structures shall be required to meet the requirements of the County Building Inspection Department and Uniform Building Code.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant effect on public health or the environment if it would result in the release of hazardous materials, or the exposure of workers or the public to hazardous materials; interfere with aviation or subject workers or the general public to aviation hazards; interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or if it would present an unacceptable risk of fire.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source #1,6,8,10,11,12)				*X*
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source #1,6,8,10,11,12)				*X*
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Source #1,6,8,10,11,12)				*X*
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source #1,6,8,10,11,12)	*X*			
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source #1,3)				*X*
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source #1,3)				*X*
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source #2,4,9)				*X*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source #1,4,6,9)				*X*

Discussion

No hazardous waste or materials shall be allowed in compliance with State regulations for a Class II landfill and under land use permits issued by the County and City of Richmond. The types of operations occurring at the BMPC have an inherent risk of accident, explosion, fire, or the release of potentially hazardous substances due to upset conditions or mechanical malfunctions. An Emergency Response Preparedness Plan and Worker Injury Prevention Plan shall be prepared in compliance with State law. The handling and drying of sludge materials may pose a health risk to workers and the public.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality if it were to result in violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; deplete groundwater; alter drainage patterns and increase the potential for erosion, siltation, or flooding; create substantial sources of polluted runoff or exceed the capacity of storm drainage systems; or expose structures and people to floods or inundation.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source #4,6,20,21)	*X*			
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Source #1,4,6,20,21)				*X*
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source #1,8,18)	*X*			
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source #1,8,18)		*X*		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source #1,2,18,20,21)			*X*	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source #1,2,18,20,21)				*X*
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source #1,4,5,9)				*X*
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source #1,4,5,9)				*X*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source #1,4,5,9)				*X*
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source #1,4,5,9)				*X*

Discussion

The WCCSL BMPC site and operations are subject to Order No. R2-2002-0066, Updated Waste Discharge Requirements adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco region (RWQCB) in June 2002. Compliance with Order No. R2-2002-0066 is required to minimize potential water quality impacts. As proposed by the applicant, all runoff from the WCCSL site, including disturbed areas and undisturbed slopes, is routed through surface water drainage facilities into the Runoff Control Pond (in Area B), via drainage channels and concrete drainage ditches. The following systems, control measures, or project features also are in effect at the WCCSL:

- Storm drainage facilities have been designed to meet the requirements of the 1,000-year, 24-hour storm event.
- The landfill is located outside of the 100-year flood plain.
- The landfill's sewer system also eliminates a number of potential water quality impacts.
- No project solid waste activity would occur within any watercourse or water body. Provision of kayak facilities does not involve solid waste but is part of the project.
- No new indirect or direct discharges of untreated water or wastewater would occur. Landfill gas condensate will continue to be managed as is currently implemented.
- The proposed height increase and grading of the landfill plateau areas will convey surface runoff to existing drainage and stormwater management facilities.
- No new construction or any other project solid waste activities would occur in the flood plain.
- Project solid waste activities would not affect the amount of surface water in any water body.

- Surface runoff would not increase; nor would any water be diverted or pumped from any waterbody.
- Groundwater pumping and/or recharge would not occur as a part of this project.
- No groundwater additions or withdrawals would occur.
- No increase in exposure of people or property to water-related hazards would occur.
- Stormwater would be conveyed to existing drainage facilities per the WCCSL SWPPP.
- All surface water would be treated and managed by the existing wastewater and stormwater management system. These procedures would prevent any discharges that could affect fisheries, endangered species, or habitat due to chemical discharges.
- The landfill discharges meet all NPDES discharge limits.

Since project activity may occur adjacent to seasonal wetlands, a potential exists for water quality impacts. This potential should be evaluated in greater detail in a project EIR.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on land use and planning if it were to physically divide an established community, conflict with local or regional land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, or if it were to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community? (Source #'s 1,3,5)				*X*
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Source #1,2,17)	*X*			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source #1,5,19)				*X*

Discussion

The General Plan Land Use Designation is OS open space and Class I Waste Disposal; zoning is P-1 Planned Unit Development/North Richmond P-1. The County Board of Supervisors adopted the "North Richmond P-1" zoning in December 1994. This zoning pulls together all of the known development criteria that would be required to review a variety of applications related to planning ordinances and other regulations. The North Richmond P-1 provides that the Integrated Resource Recovery Facility BMPC Land Use Permits 2054-92 and 2053-92 and amendments shall govern uses permitted for the BMPC project sites rather than this ordinance (Source 14). The County General Plan and the North Richmond Planned District provide for the continuation of waste disposal and recyclables processing at the WCCSL Class II landfill site for an undetermined interim period. The WCCSL is located outside the Urban Limit Line (ULL) as designated in the County General Plan.

The proposed project includes a new waste recycling center that would function as a transfer station. A transfer station currently operated by the West County Resource Recovery Corporation is located approximately one mile southeast of the WCCSL site. Development of a second transfer station in West County may conflict with adopted plans, policies, and objectives for solid waste management.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on mineral resources if it were to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or if it were to result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
MINERAL RESOURCES:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source #1,5)				*X*
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source #1,5)				*X*

Discussion:

The proposed project would not require the use of vast amounts of natural resources or minerals for construction or operation. Minor quantities of concrete and asphalt would be used for construction of the Waste Recycling Center. Small quantities of oils will be used in the operation of the IC engines. The project would recycle concrete, greenwaste, and metals and make available finished products such as gravel, asphalt, recyclable metal, and compost. These impacts would be beneficial.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XI. NOISE

Significance Criteria

Generally, a three-dBA[1] increase in ambient noise levels represents the threshold at which most people can detect a change in the noise environment; an increase of 10 dBA is perceived as a doubling of loudness. A change of 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected (Contra Costa County, 1996). For the purposes of this analysis, a net change in noise level greater than 5-DNL would constitute a significant noise impact. In addition, current land use permits 2054-92 and 2043-94 require the monitoring of noise levels at the landfill boundary or other monitored location as directed by the Community Development Department. If monitored levels exceed 60 dBA during daylight hours, or 50 dBA during the evening or night, the County would require the operator to institute additional noise reduction measures to bring noise levels to the aforementioned levels or less.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source #1,4,6)	*X*			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source #1,2,4,6)				*X*
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source #1,2,4)			*X*	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source #1,2,3,7,8)			*X*	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source #1,2)				*X*

[1] A decibel (dB) is a unit of sound energy intensity. Sound waves, traveling outward from a source, exert a sound pressure level (commonly called "sound level") measured in dB. An A-weighted decibel (dBA) is a decibel corrected for the variation in frequency response of the typical human ear at commonly encountered noise levels. All noise levels reported herein reflect A-weighted decibels unless otherwise stated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source #1,2)				*X*

Discussion

- WCCSL site is located approximately ¾ mile distance from residential areas, public areas, schools and other possible sensitive receptors. On-site and off-site noise levels could increase from vehicles transporting solid waste and operation of heavy equipment. Facility workers may also be exposed to elevated noise levels.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it directly or indirectly induces substantial population growth, or if it displaces substantial numbers of people or existing housing.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source #1,2,3,4,5)				*X*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source #1,2,3,4,5)				*X*
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source #1,2,3,4,5)				*X*

Discussion

The proposed project would be located on an existing sanitary landfill. No housing would be displaced. There is no potential for altering the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the adjacent, off-site human population.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would require provision of new governmental facilities for police, fire, parks, schools, or recreation.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
• Fire protection? (Source #1,2,3,4,6,8,9)				*X*
• Police protection? (Source #1,2,3,4,6,8,9)				*X*
• Schools? (Source #1,2,3,4,6,8,9)				*X*
• Parks? (Source #1,2,3,4,6,8,9)				*X*
• Other public facilities? (Source #1,2,3,4,6,8,9)				*X*

Discussion

The proposed project would not result in the need for additional police services, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Once constructed, facility personnel will monitor operation. The WCCSL BMPC lies within both the City of Richmond and the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County, and in the jurisdiction of the Richmond Fire Department.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIV. RECREATION

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would cause or accelerate physical deterioration of existing parks or recreation facilities, or if it would include or require new recreational facilities that would have an adverse environmental impact.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Source #1,2,3,4,15,19)			*X*	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Source #1,2,3,4,15,19)				*X*

Discussion:

The proposed project would create expanded recreational opportunities with implementation of the public access trail around the perimeter of the WCCSL site and along the Bay shoreline. This potential impact is considered beneficial.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it were to cause a substantial increase in traffic; if it were to exceed an established roadway level of service, result in a change in air traffic patterns, cause a substantial road safety hazard, result in inadequate emergency access or inadequate parking capacity, or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Source #1,2,3,4,19)	*X*			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Source #2,3,4,)	*X*			
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Source #1,2)				*X*
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source #1,2,3)				*X*
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source #1,2,3,4)				*X*
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Source #1,2,3,4,19)				*X*
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Source #1,2,5)				*X*

Discussion

The volumes of traffic that would be generated by construction of new facilities and expanded BMPC operations and operating hours have not been quantified although the Applicant has provided general estimates to the County. Additional truck traffic and auto traffic is projected to increase over existing levels. A traffic study may be necessary to evaluate whether the existing traffic network (on-site and off-site) can accommodate projected traffic levels. Richmond Parkway is a heavily used truck route. Traffic conditions during peak periods and weekends require additional analysis.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Significance Criteria

The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it exceeds the capacity of existing, or requires the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, storm drain systems, water supply, or solid waste landfills; or if it fails to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source #2,4,20,21)				*X*
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source #2,3,4,20)				*X*
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source #1,2,3,4)		*X*		
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source #1,2,3,4,)				*X*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source #2,3,4)				*X*
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Source #1,6,8)				*X*
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source #2,3,4,8,9,12,13)				*X*

Discussion

No impacts to utilities are expected to occur as a result of the expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities such as the waste recycling center. Existing landfill electrical, gas, lighting, water, wastewater, and telecommunications systems are adequate to supply proposed operations. With one exception, no modification, upgrade, or expansion of utilities outside the WCCSL site has been proposed. The exception is the proposed pipeline to convey biosolids from the adjacent West County Wastewater District plant to the proposed sludge drying area on the south slope. Depending on the final alignment of this pipeline, potential impacts could occur to resources traversed by the pipeline.

Mitigation Measures

To be evaluated in EIR.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Source #1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,15)			*X*	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Source #2,4,6,8) ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				*X*
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Source #1,2,3,7,8,9,14)	*X*			

Discussion:

The proposed project may have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, such as excessive noise, emission of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (diesel emissions), and odors. In the long term, the project would have no adverse effect on landfill closure or post closure plans. The BMPC and waste recycling center would operate only as long as market conditions are conducive. In the mid and short terms, operation of an expanded BMPC atop the plateau area would preclude alternative uses such as recreation or other commercial uses identified in the past.